

**TOWN OF ALTON
ALTON PLANNING BOARD
ZONING ORDINANCE WORKSHOP**

**January 4, 2010
Approved 1/19/2010**

Members Present: William Curtin, Chair
Timothy Roy, Vice-Chair
Scott Williams, Clerk
Thomas Hoopes, member
D. Hussey, Selectmen's Representative (arrived at 5:30 p.m.)
David Collier, Alternate

Others Present: Sharon Penney, Town Planner
Stacey Ames, Planning Assistant
Lou LaCourse, Prospective ZBA Member

I. CALL TO ORDER

William Curtin, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

II. DISCUSSION

The updated lighting regulation, incorporating the changes suggested at the December 29, 2009 meeting was discussed. It removes any reference to "ordinance"; this is a proposed lighting regulation for the town and the site plan.

T. Hoopes pointed out that on the last page, W. Curtin had asked that in the penalties section, the phrase "up to" was to be removed. It is being corrected.

"Dark Sky" information is included in the packets given to the members.

LED's were discussed.

There was discussion concerning the video recording of meetings while T. Hoopes is away.

There was discussion concerning presentation of the sexually oriented business ordinance.

The order of the warrants is going to change from what appears in the newspapers. Some of the related ordinances will be better grouped.

T. Hoopes asked about the information C. Balcius was going to get concerning the references for wetlands and flood plains; she has not yet turned this in. She will be at the meeting tomorrow night. T. Hoopes asked if the regulations could be worded so that it says the Town chooses to adopt any statewide adopted regulations. New regulations have replaced what is now in storm water. There was discussion concerning whether state regulations can be adopted automatically;

other members thought they could not. Mr. Sessler will be asked if this can be done as a blanket policy.

Returning to the lighting ordinance, the only correction noted is the removal of the phrase “up to” as it pertains to the penalty of “\$100 per day...”

W. Curtin made a motion to accept and insert the Outdoor Lighting Regulation into the Site Plan Regulations. S. Williams seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

The Site Plan Regulations signature page was signed and dated at this meeting.

W. Curtin made a motion to appoint D. Collier as a member; S. Williams seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There was discussion concerning the storm water regulations C. Balcius is researching. It was decided to table this discussion until the information is available.

The next meeting is the Public Hearing, which will be on January 5, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

There was further discussion concerning having someone video tape the meeting on January 5, 2010. The importance of recording public hearings was discussed.

B. Holmes attendance was discussed. The members’ terms were discussed. Attendance at upcoming meetings/sessions was also discussed.

T. Hoopes made files and topo maps available to the Planning Board. There are other materials available in storage.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On page 3 of 6, the first line, should have the word “had” at “S. Penney explained to members that their packet **had** everything...”

D. Hussey joined the board at this time (5:30 p.m.)

On page 3 the motion attributed to W. Curtin was made by S. Williams.

T. Roy made a motion to accept the minutes of December 29, 2009 as amended. S. Williams seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

IV. DISCUSSION

There was further discussion concerning the lighting regulation and getting it to the Selectmen. W. Curtin would also like a copy of the corrected minutes and a copy of the regulations to go to the Building Inspector’s office. S. Williams suggested a tickler system to help prospective home builders to get information regarding regulation changes as they are adopted. There was further discussion concerning needing an engineer to locate the foundation. S. Penney pointed out that they have an opportunity to re-implement the previous system, which has fallen into disuse.

There was further conversation about this and how it is done in other communities.

Restrictions and regulations have to be included in the building file and the assessors file. There was discussion concerning the covenants of subdivision associations and whether they are enforceable by the town. Specific subdivisions were discussed including easements, which should be flagged in the building code system.

There was discussion concerning the Planning Board's requirement for condo complexes to have associations; this is actually required by the State AG.

Conservation easements are all filed in the Town Hall Heidke Room, per T. Hoopes.

The wording of the proposed zoning changes on Route 11 was discussed. There was discussion concerning the use of the ordinal directions. S. Williams read Article 400, Section 441 Boundary description. "The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Zoning Regulations current boundary description through the Residential Rural Zone, headed south toward New Durham, along the east side of the road. Beginning at the northeasterly corner of parcel 9, tax map 9, which point is on the southerly side of Route 11, thence running along the northerly boundary of parcel 9 to a point at the northeasterly corner of parcel 9, thence continuing on the same course to the center line of Route 11, thence turning and running southeasterly along the center line of Route 11 to a point marking the extension of the southerly boundary of parcel 54, map 9, thence turning and running northeasterly across Route 11 to the northerly sideline of Route 11 and the southerly corner of parcel 54, thence turning and running along the southeasterly border of parcel 54 to a point at the center line of the New Durham Road, thence turning and running northwesterly along the center line of the New Durham Road to the intersection of the boundary of the existing residential commercial zone located at or near the intersection of the New Durham Road and Homestead Place. It is the intent of this amendment to include parcels 57, 57-1, 56, 54-1, and 54, in the Residential Commercial Zone."

There was discussion concerning the wording. Members used maps to plot this proposed amendment.

There was discussion concerning attendance at the public meeting tomorrow evening.

L. LaCourse asked about amendment 4 which addresses one acre lots for duplexes and multi-family dwellings. Amendments 2 and 3 seem to allow going from 3 to 9 units. The change from 4 units to 3 units per structure was explained. These amendments were explained as clarification of definitions and language. Amendment 4 applies to duplexes and multi-family dwellings; amendments 2 and 3 apply to elderly housing. L. LaCourse asked if this would affect the Christian Conference Center; members said it would not because it is a different use.

T. Roy asked about the parking issue at the Christian Conference Center; he is wondering how the parking for the new structures in addition to the existing homes is being counted and whether there is really enough parking for 2 slots for every structure. There should be an overall accounting done to see about the total number of spots needed for all of the structures. W. Curtin stated that they would say they are a walk-in community and once they get to their cabin and park they walk

everywhere unless they leave the Center. The difficulty of getting fire apparatus through there at various times was discussed.

V. ADJOURNMENT

D. Hussey made a motion to adjourn; motion was seconded by S. Williams and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Tetreau
Recorder, Workshop Session
(Not in attendance; transcribed from audio tape)